

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application, with Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 11 being independent. In the Action, Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,625,282 (Liang) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,312 (Pralus);

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang in view of Pralus and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0071586 (Sung); and

Claims 3 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang in view of Pralus, Sung, and the Specification of the Bluetooth™ System (Specification). It is respectfully requested that the above-listed rejections be withdrawn in view of the following discussion.

The present application is directed to a wireless headset with a Bluetooth™ module, which includes a sensing device configured to automatically sense a folded and unfolded position of a microphone supporting member relative to a main body of the headset. The sensing device is located within a hinge structure, allowing the microphone supporting member to fold and unfold relative to the main body, and establishes a communication link between the headset and a master terminal once the microphone supporting member is sensed to be unfolded.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1 and 11, these claims recite “a controller connected to the sensing device and the Bluetooth™ module, for connecting, using the Bluetooth™ module, a link between the wireless headset and a master terminal registered in the wireless headset if it is determined that the microphone supporting member is unfolded” in Claim 1 and “a controller connected to the sensing device, for connecting a link between the wireless headset and a master terminal registered in the wireless headset if it is determined that the microphone supporting member is unfolded” in Claim 11. These recitations teach that the folded and unfolded position of a headset is automatically determined.

Liang clearly teaches a second activation key 43 (FIG. 1) that must be manually actuated in order to enable the user to use a headset. See Column 3, lines 66-67 of Liang. In contrast, the sensing device recited in Claims 1 and 11 determines whether “the microphone supporting

member is folded or unfolded”. The controller is connected to the sensing device to automatically determine the folded and unfolded position of the headset, as recited in Claims 1 and 11. As a consequence, Liang teaches away from the invention. Furthermore, since Liang teaches a separate headset 11 (Figure 1) connected to a telephone unit 10 (Figure 1) by a telephone cable or cord 14 (Figure 3), Liang does not teach a wireless headset having a folding device at all. Pralus does not cure this deficiency of Liang.

Pralus, in column 6, lines 6-15, describes rotating a microphone of a telephone handset to achieve line connection, to cause the handset to switch from the “OFF” position to the “ON” position. Similar to the discussion above, Pralus does not suggest “a controller connected to the sensing device and the Bluetooth™ module, for connecting, using the Bluetooth™ module, a link between the wireless headset and a master terminal registered in the wireless headset if it is determined that the microphone supporting member is unfolded” as recited in Claim 1, or “a controller connected to the sensing device, for connecting a link between the wireless headset and a master terminal registered in the wireless headset if it is determined that the microphone supporting member is unfolded” as recited in Claim 11.

Moreover, there is absolutely no teaching provided in Pralus that would lead one of ordinary skill to conclude that the manual rotation of the microphone to switch the handset from the “OFF” position to the “ON” position is equivalent to the automatic “sensing device for determining whether the microphone supporting member is folded or unfolded” recited in Claims 1 and 11. Thus, Pralus cannot remedy the deficiencies of Liang. Therefore, the cited combination does not render Claims 1 and 11 obvious.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 3 and 5-10, Sung describes a folding earphone device. The Bluetooth™ Specification discloses the Bluetooth™ protocol discussed on page 1 of this application. While certain features recited in independent Claims 3 and 5-9 are indeed discussed in the Bluetooth™ Specification, the combination of Liang, Pralus, Sung and the Bluetooth™ Specification is silent regarding the following teachings of the invention:

“a sensing device for determining whether the microphone supporting member is folded or unfolded”, as recited in Claim 3;

“attempting, by the wireless headset, to establish a link between the wireless headset and

a master terminal registering therein an ID of the wireless headset, if it is detected that the microphone supporting member is unfolded”, as recited in Claim 5;

“attempting, by the wireless headset, to register an ID of the wireless headset in a counterpart terminal with a Bluetooth™ module, if the microphone supporting member is unfolded”, as recited in Claim 6;

“transmitting a link connection request message from the wireless headset to a master terminal registering therein an ID of the wireless headset, if the microphone supporting member is unfolded”, as recited in Claim 7;

“transmitting a link connection response message to the master terminal if the microphone supporting member is unfolded”, as recited in Claim 8; and

“transmitting an ID message of the wireless headset from the wireless headset to a counterpart Bluetooth™ wireless communication terminal if the microphone supporting member is unfolded”, as recited in Claim 9.

Thus, the Bluetooth™ Specification does not suggest critical components and steps recited in each of the rejected independent claims, and missing in the Liang/Pralus/Sung combination. Accordingly, each of the above-mentioned independent claims, namely Claims 1, 3, 5-9, and 11 are believed to be unobvious over the cited combination. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 4, and 10, they are believed to be patentable over the prior art due to their dependence on the respective independent Claims.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections of Claims 1-11 be withdrawn. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the rejections of these claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the printed name.

Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP

333 Earle Ovington Boulevard

Uniondale, New York 11553

(516) 228-8484

(516) 228-8516 (Facsimile)